



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

country, paralyzed its energies, stunted its intellectual and moral growth, and reduced it eventually to the condition in which it is now, fallen from its foremost place and rank in Europe to be the most imbecile and retrogressive of its states." This religious intolerance banished the industrious Jews and confiscated their property. It persecuted the Protestant heretics with still greater cruelty, on account of their religion, and compelled the industrious lowlanders of Holland to revolt and form themselves into an independent kingdom, which soon rivalled and afterwards far surpassed the cruel mother state, in trade and commerce, in naval power and foreign possessions. It also expelled the peaceful and industrious Moors, who contributed largely to the wealth and prosperity of the kingdom. In a former number of our paper (vol. ii., p. 136) we gave an exact and literal copy of the decree of Pope Clement VII., in which he not only absolves the Emperor Charles V. from his coronation oath, binding him not to disturb the Moors, but urges him to expel them or reduce them to slavery, in case they refused to embrace Christianity:—

"In case the Moors do persist in the hardness of their hearts, so as not to embrace the faith of Christ within a term prefixed by the Inquisition, they shall be commanded, upon pain of perpetual servitude and bondage, to depart out of the said kingdom, which, if they do fail to do within the time, they shall be all slaves, and treated as such."^b

Is this what Dr. Cullen means by that "true liberty," which is the consequence of the (Roman) Catholic religion prevailing—i.e., having the upper hand in a country? And what was the result? The unfortunate Moors, who were not to be converted in this summary way, were expatriated to the number of 600,000 from their pleasant homes. The expulsion of the Jews and the persecution and annihilation of all heretics followed; Spain became, *par excellence*, the most Catholic and orthodox of nations. It became the birth-place of St. Dominic and Ignatius Loyola, and the chief seat of the Holy Inquisition. But meanwhile its vast empire in Mexico and Peru faded away; its philosophers, and warriors, and statesmen became extinct, the halls of its once famous universities of Salamanca, Toledo, and Seville became silent and deserted. The glory of the nation was utterly gone, and the royal court of Madrid, in our own day, has become, perhaps, the most profligate and scandalous in all the world.

We recently congratulated ourselves and our readers on observing a bright spot on this dark horizon of religious bigotry and intolerance, which we fondly hoped might betoken the dawn of better things. We noticed the eloquent address of Don Raphael Degollado, a Roman Catholic deputy, in the Cortes or parliament of Spain (see CATHOLIC LAYMAN, October, 1855, vol. iv., p. 115), on making a motion in favour of religious liberty, which was lost only by a majority of four. Perhaps his best argument in favour of toleration was to this effect: "If the gates of hell are not to prevail against the word of God, why this puerile fear that injury could be done by another religion to the religion of Christ? If we have firm faith in the truth of our dogmas, why shut ourselves up in an impenetrable enclosure, and discuss nothing, tolerate nothing, but persecute all outside our pale?" The Roman Catholic deputy in Spain here used language which we doubt not found a cordial response in the hearts and minds of every reader of this paper, which, we trust, has ever been conducted in the true spirit of toleration and religious liberty.

^a We collect from the pages of our respected contemporary, *Revue Chrétienne* of Paris (see No. for January, 1856, p. 61) that M. de Montalembert, one of the most distinguished Roman Catholic writers now living in France, has lately published, in *Le Correspondant*, two articles which have produced the most lively sensation; in one of which he draws a parallel between the progress of events in England and Spain during the last three centuries, in language which is a model of eloquence. We hope, ere long, to recur to this subject again.

^b See 1 vol. of Geddes' Tracts, p. 29.

Don Raphael Degollado was representative of Barcelona, which, after Madrid, is the largest city in Spain, and is, above all others, the most flourishing and industrious. We, therefore, read with very great interest the following account of a transaction occurring in Barcelona, which seemed to savour something of a growing spirit of toleration on the part of the authorities in Spain. It is copied from the *Siècle*:—

"On the morning of the 22nd February, Senor Ruet, a Spaniard, Protestant pastor, was arrested, and conducted to the guard-room in the palace of the Captain-General. In the afternoon Senor Ruet wrote to General Zapatero, and from his letter the following passage is transcribed:—

"During several days past an incensed mob of fanatics, excited by some unknown agency, have gone so far as to menace my life, and have at length succeeded, by calumnies, in depriving me of my liberty. Worked on, as they are, by the spirit of intolerance, I forgive them; but as a Spanish citizen I claim from your sense of justice the protection of the laws of my country. I am ignorant of the crime of which I am accused. Is this persecution directed against my opinions or against my religious belief? I have never disguised them, nor will I ever deny them. No—not even if I be led to the stake. My religion is the religion of Christ—that which Catholic intolerance calls Protestant and heretical. Yes, General, I am a Protestant. The temple of my religious creed is my heart; God alone can read that, and He will be my supreme judge. I demand either to be set once more at liberty or to be brought before a tribunal, where at least I shall know for what cause I am accused, and placed face to face with those who have become my enemies and accusers."

"Having read this letter, the *Siècle* adds, that General Zapatero instantly summoned Senor Ruet to his presence, and, after having heard him with the utmost interest, had him instantly reconducted to his home. To the honour of the Spain of our days, it is but right to say that the press of Barcelona, and, for the most part, that of the capital, Madrid, has taken the side of liberty of conscience, against that of intolerance."^a

This narrative was most assuring and agreeable, as it led us to hope that the liberal spirit of the Captain-General, taken up by the press of Barcelona, and re-echoed by the press of Madrid on the side of liberty of conscience, and against the spirit of intolerance, would find a response in the government of her most Catholic and Orthodox Majesty the Queen of Spain. But, alas! a few days were enough to dispel this pleasing illusion! And to convince us that Catholic Spain is now as blindly intolerant as ever, we transcribe the following sad proof from a Parisian contemporary:—

The presence of a Protestant minister at Barcelona has inspired M. Arias, the Spanish Minister of Justice, to write the following circular, addressed to all the presidents of tribunals in the Peninsula, but which has not appeared in the *Madrid Gazette*:—

"The Queen has lately been informed that attempts have been made in certain points of the Peninsula to teach and propagate doctrines contrary to the very sacred dogmas of our true faith, and to that which the Holy Catholic Apostolic and Roman Church teaches. Her Majesty's government is firmly resolved to exercise the utmost rigour against those Spaniards and foreigners who may pretend, under any pretext whatever, to break or disturb the religious unity to which it has pleased Divine Providence that Spain should owe her prosperity, and upon which repose—it could not be otherwise—the second basis of the constitution by which the monarchy should be guided. In consequence, M. le President, you will arrange with the political, administrative, and ecclesiastical authorities to put a stop, at any price, to such a crime—to such an enormous scandal. You will sedulously excite the zeal of the public prosecutor, who must proceed officially against the guilty parties whenever he may suspect the accomplishment of any act contrary to the basis of the state religion. It is to be thoroughly

^a Senor Ruet is not a Protestant clergyman. He is a young artist, whose love of the arts attracted him to Italy, where he became imbued with evangelical opinions, and subsequently became a member of the Waldensian Church at Turin. Within the last few months he returned to Spain, his native land, where it appears he has with much zeal, and not without success, been labouring to diffuse that truth which he himself has embraced. — *Italian Journal*.

^b We arrive to find from *L'Univers*, of the 7th instant, that the principal paper which took part with Senor Ruet, *L'Eco de la Actualidad*, has since been suppressed. The announcement was made in the Cortes on the 24th of March by the minister, in reply to M. F. Guerau, who complained that the press in Spain was not free. These are his words:—"The Journal just named by the noble member thought proper to discuss in its columns matters of religion; but the law does not permit any publication of this kind, except on the condition of having previously obtained the authority of the bishop. The civil authority of Barcelona, with which the government is highly satisfied, told the editor to conform himself to the provisions of the law; and thereupon the latter thought it convenient to cease his publication." About as convenient as we suppose the editor of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN would, if he were obliged to ask the previous consent of the Most Reverend Paul Cullen to discuss any matter of religion! Thank God, matters are not quite come to that pass yet in Ireland.

understood that as the piety of the Queen will worthily reward the services rendered by the judges in the matter, to those who may be indifferent, or culpably tolerant, will draw upon themselves an exemplary chastisement."

In reading this, one can scarcely be sufficiently astonished at the amazing and shameless audacity of the statement that to her religious unity Spain owes her prosperity! Every man in his senses would interpret this, if not found in a royal decree, as a caustic satire on the religious tyranny of the Spanish government, which has reduced the most fertile and favoured province of Europe from the highest to the lowest rank among nations, and which might more properly be read thus—that to her religious intolerance Spain owes her degradation and ruin! But the document contains a still more flagrant and dangerous, because it is a more practical, affront to the sentiments of modern society in relation to government. The Presidents of the judicial tribunals throughout Spain are expected to arrange with the political and ecclesiastical authorities to put a stop, at any price (we suppose at the price of blood, and torture, and of human agony, and life itself, if necessary), to such a crime (viz.:—the propagation of doctrines contrary to the sacred dogmas of the Roman Church), and the zeal of the state prosecutor (the Spanish Attorney-General) is to be sedulously excited to proceed against the guilty parties whom they may suspect; and, worse than all, the piety of the Queen (the most reputable of women and of Sovereigns) will worthily reward the services of the judges who may be zealous, and will chastise with exemplary chastisement those who may be indifferent or culpably tolerant. In truth, the cruel Judge Jeffreys, sent out on his "bloody assizes," could not have a commission addressed to him in terms more abominable or with the fell instigation to accomplish his judicial murders more vehemently pressed upon him. May we venture to ask is this the kind of "true" liberty which Dr. Cullen says invariably follows where the Roman Catholic religion prevails?

We are sorry to find that Dr. Cullen has allowed another month to pass without taking any further notice of our periodical, or availing himself of the liberal offer which we made him in our February number, to place a considerable portion of our paper at his disposal, for the purpose of proving what he had thought proper to assert of us in a late Pastoral.

No doubt the most reverend delegate Apostolic has his own reasons for adopting the course of publicly asserting what he is unable to prove, and trying to put down a periodical of which he has perhaps some reason to be afraid, by the summary process of an authority which he may possibly find ere long to be an overstrained one.

We were at first disposed to think our case a hard one; but a little further experience of the kind of "civil and religious liberty" which Dr. Cullen is disposed to allow, even to Roman Catholic newspapers wholly devoted to his own creed and party, has helped materially to reconcile us to it. If it be true that

"Friends in distress
Make sorrows the less,"

much consolation has, indeed, been provided for us, and a cordial balm to heal our wounded feelings, in seeing the most "orthodox" of journals placed conspicuously in the Index Prohibitorius of the Most Rev. Dr. Cullen, alongside with the CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

We scarcely, indeed, expected to see the day when the Apostolic delegate, imported from Rome (that seat of all civil and religious liberty!), should expel the *Telegraph*, *Nation*, and *Tablet* newspapers from the reading-rooms of the Catholic Young Men's Society, in the city of Dublin.

The three most orthodox (in the Roman Catholic sense) journals in the kingdom are all con-

demned to suffer expurgatorial pains equally with the poor CATHOLIC LAYMAN!

One of these papers—the *Nation*—regards it as a very scandalous circumstance “that every organ of Catholic opinion in this city (Dublin), edited by a Catholic editor, has been publicly subjected to a wholesale censure.”

Our readers will naturally ask, what is the grave offence of which this organ of public opinion, patronised, we believe, by no inconsiderable number of the Roman Catholic clergy and laity through Ireland, has been guilty? In truth, nothing more than printing in its columns a speech delivered by a rev. archdeacon of the Roman Catholic Church—Archdeacon Fitzgerald, of Rathkeale—in his own parish and to his own congregation.

What was the offence of the still more orthodox *Tablet*, which, if we be informed correctly, is under the special patronage of no less a personage than Cardinal Wiseman? No more than this, that it published a letter from a priest in Ossory, which was not agreeable to “his Grace.” Now, we do not undertake to vindicate anything that the archdeacon in Rathkeale or the priest in Ossory may have said or written—it may have been very good or very bad—we have no sympathy with political priests or clergymen of any creed; but if they were guilty of insubordination or indiscretion, we suppose they were amenable to their bishops, and to the discipline of their Church, which is strict enough when those in power desire to exercise it. But what ideas of civil liberty must Dr. Cullen have imbibed at Rome, when he conceives the printing of these speeches on political matters to be a ground of interdict as regards the newspapers, which, no doubt, provided as best they could for the instruction or entertainment of their readers.

It has been said that they inculcated resistance to spiritual authority; this however has been denied, and not proved.

But in what sense, is it even alleged that they inculcated resistance to spiritual authority? Not certainly in spiritual matters, but in temporal matters, in concerns of politics and government, in which the humblest Roman Catholic peasant in Ireland has just as good a right to form and express an opinion as Dr. Cullen himself.

The fact of the matter appears to be this, that Dr. Cullen thought he could control the bishops, priests, and laity to adopt that line of political action which seemed to him and his correspondents in Rome to be the most likely to obtain their particular objects. The priests and the laity, and most of the bishops, thought differently; and the organs of their opinions, the *Telegraph*, the *Tablet*, and the *Nation*, of course, re-echoed the sentiments of their patrons, and hence they and Dr. Cullen have come into collision. One appeal to Rome was recently prosecuted by the late Mr. Frederick Lucas, the editor of the *Tablet*, but there Dr. Cullen was too strong for the editor and member of Parliament, and the appeal was dismissed, and now the Apostolic delegate has it all in his own power, and gives us a foretaste of “civil and religious liberty,” according to the Roman pattern, by expelling from the public reading-rooms of a society under his own immediate patronage the organs of the most considerable portion of the Roman Catholic clergy and laity in Ireland, because they ventured to hold opinions upon matters of state policy and temporal matters different from his.

After this specimen of episcopal forbearance and toleration to his own most orthodox journals, what justice or fair play can the CATHOLIC LAYMAN expect to receive at his hands, which openly disputes his authority to put down discussion, even as to matters of religion?

Let our Roman Catholic countrymen take warning in time, and see before it is too late the amount of civil and religious liberty they

can reasonably hope for, if the power of the Apostolic delegate should ever become equal to his will; and the struggle now beginning in Spain should have to be recommenced in this country to re-establish a free press as the only bulwark of true liberty, either civil or religious.

Correspondence.

ON WITHHOLDING THE CUP FROM THE LAITY, AND THE INVOCATION OF SAINTS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR,—The terms in which you advert to “the flattering silence of all the leading Roman Catholic publications of the day,” &c. (CATHOLIC LAYMAN for January, 1856, page 7), can only acquire for your past labours a factitious authority, which, with the unbiassed advocate of truth, must be of merely ephemeral duration. And to intimate, as you triumphantly do, that, owing to either a consciousness of a deficiency of learning, or a lurking distrust of the goodness of their cause, your contemporaries have been constrained into this *flattering silence*; and to infer from this silence the invincible character of the proofs you have given of the *errors of Romanism*, is, in the first instance, to impose upon your readers arbitrary assumption for matter of fact; and, next, to put forward the unwarrantable deductions consequent on these false premises as irresistible arguments in support of your statements: it is merely begging the question. The examination of a few of your leading arguments will, at once, make it manifest that you have not succeeded in establishing even a scintilla of doubt respecting any one of the Catholic principles you have undertaken to controvert. You cite Pope Leo the Great, *Serm. iv., de Quadrag.* (CATHOLIC LAYMAN, June, 1852, page 63), with an intent to implicate the Catholic Church in the sacrilegious heresy of the Manicheans; and this you attempt by an unpardonable omission of a most important part of the context, thus—“*Cumque ad legendam infidelitatem suam nostris audeant interesse mysteriis; ita in sacramentorum communione se temperant, ut interdum rutilius luteant.*” “And to conceal their heresy they dare to be present at our mysteries; thus do they communicate in the sacrament, that they may, in the meantime, more safely escape detection.” Now, how could these Manicheans, who pretended to be Catholics, and who communicated under the species of bread alone, and who refused to receive the cup, “affirming that wine is the gall of the devil; that Christ was not born in human flesh, and had not shed his blood for man’s redemption,” &c.—(August, Lib. de Hær., cap. 46)—how, I say, could these heretics hope so thoroughly to escape detection, by their receiving in *one kind* only, if such a practice was not then permitted in the Church? And yet Pope Leo tells us they hoped, by receiving under one kind, effectually to escape detection and to conceal their wicked principles; which they could not expect to do if the Catholic Christians of Rome were not at liberty to receive in one kind, or in both, as they thought fit. Moreover, if all Christians were indispensably obliged to receive under *both kinds*, would it not have been childish and absurd in the Pope to decree that they should do that which, without exception, as Christians they always did? Would not the Manicheans have been at once discovered by their half communion? Besides, Pope Leo, by the particle *omnino*, marks a precise distinction between the Christians who, *sometimes*, as was optional with them, abstained from the use of the cup, and the Manicheans who *at all times* refused it through the superstitious and impious motives just mentioned; and with respect to which, and not to communion in one kind, we are to understand him saying, “They at all times refuse to drink the blood of our redemption,” &c.; and Pope Gelasius, “The division of one and the same mystery,” &c.

You put forward Cardinal Bona to show that “from the origin of the Church to the twelfth century the faithful, at all times and in all places, communicated under the species of bread and wine;” but why, I ask, omit the broad distinction which the Cardinal makes, in the same page from which you quote, between public communion in the eucharistic sacrifice and private communions out of the Church, when he tells you, “It is certain that the clergy and laity, men and women, received the sacred mysteries under both kinds when present at the eucharistic sacrifice, and made their offering, and partook of the oblation; but out of the sacrifice, and out of the Church, always and everywhere the communion was administered under one kind?” Why not give the Cardinal’s words entire, instead of the garbled passage set forth by you? Why not vindicate the truth at any sacrifice?

The Cardinal in another place relates a remarkable instance of a monk who asked the Bishop of Corinth “How the religious solitaries could receive the sacrament without the ministry of a priest?” to whom the Bishop replied, “Let them preserve some of the sacred particles, and instead of the sacred liquor let them drink a cup of wine.—(Cardinal Bona, *De Rebus Liturg.*, tom. ii., page 703.)

Thus, instead of proving that the primitive Church held communion in one kind to be a *sacrilege*, and contrary to Christ’s institution, Cardinal Bona evinces that AT ALL

TIMES, AND IN ALL PLACES, the Church ever held private communion under one kind, and public communion under both kinds, to be of co-ordinate value, and equally affording to the faithful recipients all the advantages of the sacrament.

Tertull. *ad uxor.*, Lib. ii., cap. v., page 430; St. Cyprian *De Lapsis*, page 189, with a host of others that might be cited, prove that in the third century the Christians were allowed to take home with them the consecrated element of bread for private communion; and that such a practice was allowed the faithful when by reason of persecutions they could not meet in public to celebrate the sacred mysteries. The blessed eucharist was also administered to the sick under one kind in the third century. Euseb. *Hist. Eccles.*, Lib. vi., cap. 44, page 246; and in the same manner in the fourth century, Tom. i., Opera Ambrosii, page 44, Colonise.

St. Chrysostom, near the end of the fourth century, in the Church of Constantinople, administered the blessed sacrament under the species of bread alone to a woman who pretended to be a convert from the Macedonian heresy, and who, by the help of her maid, substituted for the sacred element a piece of common bread, which was changed into a stone in her mouth; which miracle caused her to confess the fraud to St. Chrysostom, and to return to the true faith.—Sozomen, Lib. viii., cap. v., page 764. And in the whole relation of this miracle there is not the slightest allusion to the species of wine, although it is stated that, as a proof of the truth of the narrative, the stone, with the marks of the teeth impressed upon it, was for a long time afterwards preserved in the church, and exhibited to the public. And hence we have an undeniable proof that public communion in both kinds was not then an indispensable law in the Church; for, as the cup was to be administered at the hand of the deacon, not placed in the hand of the communicant, as the species of bread was, it would be impossible for this woman to have impiously concealed the liquid species, if such had been offered to her, or if she were of necessity bound to receive it. I agree with Plessneus, Lib. i., de Eucharistia, cap. 12, page 163, that Sozomen here treats of the administration of public communion in the Church of Constantinople; but I maintain that he establishes an indisputable proof that the Christians there were at liberty to receive under one kind, or under both kinds, as thought proper; and that such was the practice of the entire Church until Pope Leo the Great first decreed that all the Christians in Rome should receive under both species for the sake of detecting the Manicheans, as already observed.

But, with the evidence alone of Cardinal Bona opposed to you, it will puzzle your ingenuity to condemn the primitive Catholic Church, which “at all times, and in all places, administered private communion under one kind;” yet this you must do before you can show that the denunciations of Pope Leo the Great and of Pope Gelasius involve the condemnation of the present Catholic Church.

In number for June, 1854, page 71, you give, in a marginal note, what you allege to be a passage from the Council of Trent explicatory of the Catholic doctrine of the invocation of saints; but, by garbling and omitting the precise and determinate diction of the original you mould the passage into a formula as much detested by Catholics as the most impious tenet of the Koran, which excludes the mediatorship of Christ to make way for the impostor Mahomet. The consequences which you want to establish could not succeed from any other than the spurious passage, by means of which, and by no surer criterion, you attempt to question the truth of that doctrine by which Catholics entreat the saints to pray to God for them to obtain all the graces and blessings necessary for them, through Jesus Christ. From these false premises you conclude that Catholics pray to the saints “as direct dispensers of grace, assistance, and safety;” and “without doubt such prayers are an act of religious worship,” &c.

But the fallacy of these conclusions will be truly manifest by a comparison of your version of the passage with the original text, both of which I shall place in parallel position.

CATHOLIC LAYMAN’S text, June, Genuine text, Council of Trent, 1854, page 71. Sess. xxv.—De Invocatione

“Bonum atque utile sup- pliciter eos invocare et ob be- neficia impetranda a Deo, ad regnantes, orationes suas pro eorum orationes, opem, auxiliumque confugere.”	“Sanctos, una cum Christo impetranda a Deo, ad regnantes, orationes suas pro eorum orationes, opem, auxiliumque confugere.”
--	---

Our Saviour, by his passion and death, merited for us a superabundant supply of graces; and to apply the graces to our necessities he “always maketh intercession for us” (Rom. viii., 34). We are assured that the saints in heaven pray also for an application of these graces to us, and hence we invoke them, not “as dispensers of grace,” &c., but that they may join their prayers with ours, that, as joint-suppliants (so we hold the doctrine of *communion of saints*) our petitions may be acceptable with God, “through Jesus Christ our Lord, who alone is our Redeemer and Saviour,” as specified in the genuine text—a conclusion which cannot be deduced from the passage in the form which you cited it, as you have omitted